

Docket No. RPC 0491 PUS;  
67080-036

APPELLANT:	Apps et al.	ART UNIT:	3637
SERIAL NO.:	09/439,427	EXAMINER:	Jose Chen
FILED:	11/15/1999		
FOR:	PLASTIC PALLET		

Dear Sir:

Appellant files this Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed September 16, 2009.

The Examiner has mischaracterized Appellant's arguments and the Declaration of William P. Apps. Rather than Appellant repeating it entirely here, the Board is urged to read Mr. Apps' declaration. However, to summarize, there is a discernible difference between a polymer surface that has been "mechanically scuffed" (as claimed) and a polymer with a molded-in "knurled or roughened surface" (as in the Wyler reference). Further, to the extent that there may be some ambiguity in the description of "knurled or roughened" in the Wyler reference, this is resolved by the fact that the reinforcing bars of Wyler are fiberglass reinforced plastic. It would

Docket No. RPC 0491 PUS;  
67080-036

be undesirable to “mechanically scuff” fiberglass reinforced plastic because that would expose and damage the fiberglass fibers. Therefore, the “knurled or roughened” surface of Wyler must be molded-in, which as noted is discernible from “mechanically scuffing.”

**CLOSING**

For the reasons set forth above, the final rejection of all claims is improper and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

/John E. Carlson/

John E. Carlson, Reg. No. 37,794  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds PC  
400 W. Maple Rd., Suite 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8681

Dated: November 16, 2009